



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: December 14, 2018

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2018-ADM-0088 CROSS REFERENCE #: 2018-0187

TITLE: Suspected forgery of signature on hiring freeze waiver document, Office of the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency

### CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
Unknown	Washington, DC	

#### POTENTIAL VIOLATION(S):

Forgery

#### ALLEGATIONS:

On March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018, the Environmental Protection Agency Office of Inspector General (EPA-OIG) Hotline referred complaint number 2018-0187 to the Washington Field Office (WFO), Office of Investigations (OI), EPA-OIG. The complaint was alleged by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) In the complaint, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated a signature appearing on a hiring freeze waiver request form was not that of the senior approving official. The senior approving official (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) brought this to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) attention.

#### FINDINGS:

Interviews with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) revealed that neither party were sure of whether the signature on the hiring freeze document was a forgery. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) could not definitively state that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not sign the document. Neither party interviewed stated they suspected anyone in the office of committing the forgery. They additionally stated the hiring of the individual the document was signed for had already been completed, and any forgery of the signature on the document would have not materially affected the outcome of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) hire. Neither party suspected the employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who did not have access to the document.

**DISPOSITION:**

Inconclusive. Closed.

Since the individual whose signature was alleged to have been forged could not definitively state that it was not actually (b) signature, along with the fact that had (b) signature been forged it would not have affected the hiring process associated with this action, this case is closed.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: NOVEMBER 29, 2018

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2018-ADM-0024

CROSS REFERENCE #: N/A

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) GS-15, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	WASHINGTON, DC	N/A

VIOLATION(S): Forgery

COMPLAINT: On November 22, 2017, the Office of Inspector General hotline received a complaint from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regarding potential employee misconduct. (b) (6), alleged that someone forged (b) (6), 2017 mid-year performance review ("review") by writing (b) (6), initials and date on the review.

Special Agents interviewed (b) (6), who stated (b) (6), (b) (7) suspected (b) (6), supervisor (b) (6), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of forging (b) (6), review. (b) (6), (b) (7) stated only (b) (6), and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, had access to the review.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS: Special Agents interviewed (b) (6), (b) (6), denied initialing the review and stated that (b) (6) did not recall anyone initialing the review other than (b) (6), (b) (6), (b) (7) stated (b) (6) has complete access to the review until the end of the year when it is passed to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) informed Special Agents that (b) (6) did not believe (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) would have initialed the review.

Special Agents interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) denied forging the review and did not have any knowledge as to who could have forged the review. (b) (6), stated that (b) (6) has never heard of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) forging the signature of other employees.

There are no investigative findings and this investigation is inconclusive.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

**RECOMMENDATION:** This matter is inconclusive. There are no further investigatory steps and this investigation is recommended for closure.

---

**RESTRICTED INFORMATION**

Page 2

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

CASE #: OI-HQ-2018-THT-0037

CROSS REFERENCE #: N/A

TITLE: GENERAL THREAT CASE FOR 2018

INTERVIEWEE (if applicable): N/A

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), SPECIAL AGENT

MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY  
Case Closing Report

**NARRATIVE:** On January 29, 2019, Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency, directed Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), OI, OIG, EPA, to close the General Threat Case File for 2018.

SA (b) (6) was directed by Patrick Sullivan (AIGI Sullivan), Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, OI, OIG, EPA, to create the General Threat Case File for 2018, and to enclose all instances of concern or unusual direction interests which, do not merit full investigatory action.

The entities entered into this General Case File will be memorialized for historical purposes. If new information about a potential entity becomes available, or should the OIG assess a need, the OIG reserves the ability to investigate accordingly.

CASE: OI-HQ-2018-THT-0037

INTERVIEWEE (if applicable): N/A

DATE OF ACTIVITY:  
1/29/2019

DRAFTED DATE: 1/29/2019

AGENT(S):  
SA (b) (6)

RESTRICTED INFORMATION  
Page 1 of 1

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
61 FORSYTH STREET, SW  
ATLANTA, GA 30303

**CASE #:** OI-AT-2019-ADM-0007

**CROSS REFERENCE #:** COMP-2019-7

**TITLE:** CONCEALMENT OF ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES AT THE OLD GUN CLUB ROAD  
LANDFILL BY CITY OF ATLANTA OFFICIALS

**INTERVIEWEE:** *(if applicable):* N/A

**PREPARED BY:** (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

**MEMORANDUM OF ACTIVITY**  
**FINAL SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT:** On September 19, 2018, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged the City of Atlanta operated an illegal landfill adjacent to (b) (6) property from 1968 to 1974. (b) (6) said the city has continued dumping debris on private property in the area, which it has refused to remove. (b) (6) also said city officials are corruptly attempting to use imminent domain to take (b) (6) property to conceal the existence of the landfill.

**BACKGROUND:** On September 19, 2018, SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) regarding a report of alleged illegal dumping and possible corruption by the City of Atlanta. During the interview, (b) (6) essentially stated City of Atlanta workers were dumping trash on (b) (6) and others property, located outside the permitted area adjacent to the Gun Club Road Landfill. (b) (6) also indicated (b) (6) believes leeching from the unpermitted area was responsible for significant contamination in Proctor Creek. (b) (6) said (b) (6) has reported the incidents to both the City of Atlanta and the Georgia Environmental Division (EPD), both of which have refused to acknowledge the problem or take corrective actions. (b) (6) opined publicity of the dumping and subsequent leeching of contaminants would hamper the city's redevelopment efforts and suggested a "cover-up" by the city and EPD. (b) (6) also stated the EPA has funded assessments in the immediate area using a Brownfield Grant.

**CASE:**  
OI-AT-2019-ADM-0007

**INTERVIEWEE:** N/A

**DATE OF ACTIVITY:**  
Various

**DRAFTED DATE:**  
02/08/2019

**AGENT:**  
SA  
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

**RESTRICTED INFORMATION**  
Page 1 of 2

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.

**INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:** SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) contacted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, Region 4, who located Brownfield Grant (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) performed a review of the grant and interviewed the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated no sites adjacent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property received a Brownfield assessment during the project. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) initially stated the City of Atlanta denied access to sites adjacent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property, but later clarified the city failed to respond to a request to access city parks for a infrastructure viability study. SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) found no projects on or adjacent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property that were funded by the EPA.

SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted multiple interviews with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and reviewed documents (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided as proof of the alleged corruption. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) owns multiple properties in the area, one of which is located between the unpermitted dumping area and a closed landfill. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) believes if the city takes (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property, they will be able to cover up the unpermitted landfill and related contamination forever. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is also concerned about health risks to the citizens in the area and the contamination to nearby Proctor Creek. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) believes the city is concealing the contamination as it would have a negative effect on nearby property values slow development. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) opines the city likely has made a deal with a local developer to assist in the concealment. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has active litigation against the city and is seeking compensation for the long-term dumping that has resulted in a loss of value for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) land. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) also provided evidence of the existence of the unpermitted landfill, which the city denies.

**RECOMMENDATION:** During multiple contacts with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) made accusations of corruption and wrongdoing against “city officials” but could not provide a specific name or a specific act (bribery, kickback, etc) occurring due to the alleged cover-up. Also, no EPA funds were found to be expended in areas on or adjacent to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property. There was no evidence to indicate that a crime occurred, so this investigation was not presented to the United States Department of Justice. No further investigative activities remain, and it is recommended this investigation be closed.

**CASE:**  
OI-AT-2019-ADM-0007

**INTERVIEWEE:** N/A

**DATE OF ACTIVITY:**  
Various

**DRAFTED DATE:**  
02/08/2019

**AGENT:**  
SA  
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

**RESTRICTED INFORMATION**  
Page 2 of 2

This report and any attachments are the property of the EPA Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced or disclosed without written permission. This report contains information protected by the Privacy Act and is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Disclosure of this report to unauthorized persons is prohibited. See 5 U.S.C. 552a.